MINUTES OF THE MEETING
OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS ON DECEMBER 19, 1961

The Commission met, in executive session and pursuant to notice, at 2:00 p.m., with David E. Finley, Chairman, presiding.

Present were: David E. Finley
Felix de Weldon
William Perry
Michael Rapuano
Ralph Walker

L. R. Wilson, Secretary
Charles H. Atherton, Asst. Secretary
C. L. Martin, Counsel
Susan E. Bennett, Admin. Asst.
Gilbert Halasz, Recorder

I. ADMINISTRATION

1. Date of Next Meeting

The members agreed that the next meeting of the Commission would be held on January 17, 1962 at 9:30 a.m., with an executive session on January 16, 1962 at 2:00 p.m.

The dates of February 20 and 21, 1962 were tentatively selected for the February meeting.

2. Approval of Minutes

Mr. Perry requested that the minutes of the meeting on November 21, 1961 be amended to show that he was not present for either the preliminary discussion by the members of the buildings on Lafayette Square or the discussion later in the day with the architects. The members agreed this amendment should be made.

The minutes, with the inclusion of the change recommended by Mr. Perry, were approved.

3. Removal of Temporary Buildings, Draft Resolution

The Chairman read a draft of a resolution concerning the removal of temporary buildings, built during the war emergencies, from the Mall and other park areas of the city of Washington.

It was pointed out that these temporary buildings continued to exist, in spite of schedules for their demolition established by the General Services Administration, because of the continuing demand for federal office space. The members expressed the opinion that a program of demolition should

be established and strictly adhered to, and that agencies in need of office space could be temporarily housed in private buildings until federal space was provided for them.

After some discussion, the resolution was adopted as drafted. It was agreed to release the resolution to the press on the following day.

EXHIBIT A

II. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

1. National Capital Downtown Committee

Action Plan

The Commission conferred with Mr. Knox Banner, Executive Director, Mr. Leo Stern, Deputy Director, Mr. Melvin Levine, Chief Planner, and Mr. Paul Spreiregen, Planning Designer, all of the National Capital Downtown Committee, on further developments of the Committee's plan for the rehabilitation and rejuvenation of the downtown business district of Washington.

Mr. Stern began the presentation by pointing out that when the Committee had last met with the Commission in January, 1961 only a series of general suggestions of how the city might be developed had been shown. In the last twelve months, however, a number of studies by the Committee and other groups had been completed which have now been incorporated into the Committee's proposals. The conclusions reached have, in some cases, resulted in revisions of the earlier proposals. He then introduced Mr. Levine to explain the changes and the resulting new proposals.

Mr. Levine explained that the completed studies had indicated that by 1980 the Metropolitan area would have a population of 3 million four hundred thousand, whereas the Committee had first estimated that the 1980 population would be approximately three million. He indicated that this in turn meant an increased demand for hotel and motel facilities and apartment units, and reflected an increase of 25,000 in federal employment in the area. He also indicated that a greater emphasis was to be given mass transportation than originally planned and that hopefully by 1980 75% of the people visiting the downtown area would do so by rapid transit.

Mr. Levine then showed a number of drawings illustrating proposals for improving the street patterns in the downtown area, parking facilities, transportation facilities, etc.

The members were asked to express their opinion on a proposal to permit building heights to be extended to 130 feet in the business district of the city zoned as C-4. The C-4 District is now limited to 110 feet.

In replying to this proposal the members agreed that the height limitation in the central business district should not be raised to a maximum of 130 feet. It was suggested that instead of establishing a 130 foot maximum building height the zoning laws might be changed to establish a minimum building height on certain streets in the downtown area which would help to avoid the "saw-toothed" profile of building fronts created by the presence of one or two story buildings interspersed with higher buildings.

Mr. Levine asked for the Commission's advice upon extending some form of architectural control to the construction, alteration and remodeling of private structures along certain important streets, parks and circles of the city. He showed the members a map of the city indicating areas in which such control might be applied. The members replied that this was such a complex problem it would require a great deal of study. They agreed to take the question under advisement.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter for the Chairman's signature setting forth the Commission's views. EXHIBIT B

2. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Federal Office Building No. 5, Independence Avenue, S.W.

The Commission met with Mr. J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Architectural and Structural Division, Public Buildings Service, Mr. Nathaniel Curtis, Jr., architect of Curtis and Davis, Mr. Grad, architect of Frank Grad & Sons, and Mr. Fordyce, architect of Fordyce and Hamby, to discuss the preliminary design concept for the office building.

Mr. Snyder explained that it was originally proposed that two L-shaped buildings of identical size be erected facing the Tenth Street Mall at Independence Avenue. However, after studying the site the architects had recommended a new arrangement of the buildings. Mr. Snyder than called upon Mr. Curtis to explain the architect's proposal.

Mr. Curtis stated that after studying the site and plans for the Tenth Street Mall project the architects had concluded that rather than flank the Mall the building should span it. He then showed a model and drawings of a building which would face north and south with lower wings paralleling the Tenth Street Mall. The central building would be approximately 800 feet long and four to six stories high. The wings parallel to Tenth Street were two or three stories high.

There was a general discussion of the effect upon the Tenth Street Mall which a building spanning it would produce. The members were of the opinion that the proposed building would tend to minimize the "hump" in the Mall created by the elevation necessary to bridge the railroad tracks.

They believed that the design would be improved if the bulk of the building above the first story was set back thereby reducing the massive qualities of such a large scale building. They also strongly urged that the architects consider reducing the length of the building to perhaps 600 feet.

The members also recognized that a building spanning the Tenth Street Mall would in fact visually enclose it and add emphasis to the L'Enfant Mall. They concluded that for this reason they would approve the new proposal in principle.

The architects agreed to study the Commission's recommendations and to submit the results of their studies at a later date.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter for the Chairman's signature setting forth the Commission's recommendations. EXHIBIT C

3. Department of the Interior

Interview with Secretary of the Interior Udall

a. Draft Legislation to Create National Capital Parks Memorial Board

The Commission met with Secretary of Interior Udall to discuss the draft of proposed legislation which would create a National Capital Parks Memorial Board to advise the Secretary of the Interior on criteria for the creation of memorials on federal park land in the District of Columbia. The text of the proposed bill appears as EXHIBIT D.

Mr. Udall explained that he had long been impressed with the fact that there are no set policies either in Congress or the Executive Branch of the Government in regard to who may be memorialized in the District. He said that it was his observation that statues and memorials appear to be erected because of pressures put upon Congressmen to introduce the necessary legislation. Mr. Udall stated that he believed a firm set of principles or criteria would be welcomed by Congress and could help to reduce the flood of bills introduced each year to memorialize various individuals in Washington. He explained that he did not necessarily believe that the proposed memorial board was the best answer to the problem and would like to have the Commission's advice. He particularly asked the members to advise him upon the propriety of a requirement that no memorial could be established in Washington until the individual sought to be memorialized had been dead a minimum number of years.

The Chairman explained to the Secretary that the principal duty imposed upon the Commission of Fine Arts by the enabling Act of May 10, 1910 was the duty to advise upon the location of statues, monuments and memorials in the District of Columbia; also, that the National Capital Planning Commission was later given authority to advise upon sites for memorials. He

inquired whether there was any real need for an additional board in view of these existing agencies.

Mr. Udall agreed that perhaps what was needed was not another agency but an addition to the authority of the Commission of Fine Arts which would authorize the Commission to have some voice upon the question of whether or not a proposed statue or memorial was appropriate. The members and Mr. Udall agreed that the Congress has the ultimate prerogative to determine if a memorial should be erected in the city. The Secretary said that he hoped that Congress itself would establish certain criteria such as a minimum waiting period.

After some further discussion the Commission passed a motion to the effect that no statue to an individual shall be erected in public space in Washington until the individual has been dead for a period of at least twenty years.

The members also agreed in regard to the draft bill to report to the Bureau of the Budget that after consulting with the Secretary of the Interior the Commission believes it and the Planning Commission are authorized to advise upon these matters and that the establishment of another board was unnecessary.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter to the Director of the Bureau of the Budget setting forth the Commission's recommendation.EXHIBIT E

b. Relocation of Benjamin Rush Statue

Secretary Udall expressed his views upon the relocation of the statue of Doctor Benjamin Rush to the campus of Dickenson College in Carlisle, Pennsylvania. He said that he believed the memory of Benjamin Rush would be more significantly served by giving him a place of honor at the college than by moving his statue to some by-way or inconspicuous place where people would not recognize him. He said that this was the thought which had motivated him and not any desire to move statuary out of Washington.

The Chairman replied that the Commission believed that the great honor paid to Dr. Rush, who was a signer of the Declaration of Independence, was that his statue was in Washington, the capital of his country. He also pointed out that under the L'Enfant plan for the city there are many small triangular parks which should be used for pieces of sculpture. The Secretary agreed that sculpture could be used in these small parks.

No decision concerning a new site for the Rush statue was reached in the discussion with Secretary Udall. Subsequently, the members agreed to write to him again and recommend the park at 18th and Pennsylvania Avenue as a site for the monument. It was also agreed that the National Library of Medicine, located at the National Institute of Health in Bethesda,

Maryland would be an excellent alternative location, but would not be formally proposed as such until a positive decision had been made regarding the first choice.

The Secretary was directed to prepare a letter setting forth the Commission's views. EXHIBIT F

4. Department of the Army, Office of the Quartermaster General, Heraldic Institute

Letter from General B. E. Kendall

The Chairman read a letter from the Acting Deputy of the Quartermaster General, dated December 12, 1961 stating that the Heraldic Institute is considering the Commission's suggestion made at the October meeting, that sculptors outside of the government be employed by the Heraldic Institute to execute designs for national medals. EXHIBIT G

The members were gratified that their suggestion was being considered and expressed the hope that the Heraldic Institute would adopt this practice. No action was taken.

5. American Battle Monuments Commission

Proposed Guam Memorial - Recommendation of John Carl Warneke as Architect

The members confirmed their individual recommendations, received by mail, approving the selection of John Carl Warneke as architect for a memorial to be erected on Guam to commemorate its recapture during World War II and the memory of those servicemen who gave their lives during these operations.

A letter from the Chairman recommending the designation appears as EXHIBIT H.

6. National Capital Planning Commission

Georgetown Waterfront Development Proposal

The Assistant Secretary informed the members that on the following day Mr. William Finley, Director of the National Capital Planning Commission would appear to explain a staff proposal for the redevelopment of the Georgetown waterfront. A pamphlet explaining the need for renewal of the area had been sent to the members by mail. EXHIBIT I

Copies of a report approved by the Old Georgetown Panel of Architects were distributed to the members for their information. EXHIBIT J

No action was taken pending the conference on the following day.

Respectfully submitted,

C. L. Martin

C.L.Martin, Counsel

MEETING OF THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
19 December 1961

ORDER OF BUSINESS

PM
2:00 1. CONVENE, ROOM 7000, INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING

2. ADMINISTRATION

a. Date of Next Meeting: 17 January 1961

Executive Session: 16 January 1961

b. Approval of Minutes of November 1961 Meeting

c. Removal of Temporary Buildings, Draft Resolution

3. SUBMISSIONS-REVIEWS-INTERVIEWS

2:15 a. National Capital Downtown Committee

Action Plan
(Mr. Knox Banner, Executive Director; Mr. Leo Stern, Deputy Director; Mr. Melvin Levine, Chief Planner; Mr. Paul Spreiregen, Planning Designer)

3:00 b. General Services Administration, Public Buildings Service

Federal Office Building No. 5, Independence Avenue, S.W. and 10th Street S. W. Mall (Mr. L. L. Hunter, Assistant Commissioner for Design and Construction, PBS,GSA; Mr.J. Rowland Snyder, Director, Architectural and Structural Division, PBS, GSA;Mr. Curtis, architect of Curtis and Davis; Mr. Grad, architect of Frank Grad & Sons; Mr. Fordyce, architect of Fordyce and Hamby)

3:45 c. Department of the Interior

(1) National Park Service, National Capital Parks

National Capital Parks Operations Building, West Potomac Park, Revised Design (Mr. T. Sutton Jett, Superintendent, National Capital Parks; Mr. William Haussmann, Chief, Architectural Division, National Capital Parks; Mr. Charles Lessig, Chief Architect, National Capital Parks)

4:30 (2) Interview with Secretary of the Interior Stewart Udall

(a) Relocation of Benjamin Rush Statue

(b) Draft Legislation-National Capital Parks Memorial Board

d. U.S. Army, Office of the Quartermaster General

Commissioning Sculptors for Work in Heraldic Institute - Letter

e. American Battle Monuments Commission

Proposed Guam Memorial - Confirmation of Recommendation of John Carl Warneke as architect.

f. National Capital Planning Commission

The Georgetown Waterfront Development Proposal

g. District of Columbia Government, Department of Licenses and Inspections

(1) Shipstead-Luce Act

(a) Building Applications - Appendix 1, dated 12/19/61.

(b) Enterprise Federal Savings and Loan Association, 813-15 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W. (Ref. S.L. 2371) Sign and bas-relief of eagle.

(c) Office Building at 1345 E Street, N.E. (Ref. S.L. 2431) - Sample of Granite

(d) Watergate Development - Status

(e) Board of Appeals and Review - Hearing on S.L. 2440, Sidewalk Canopy, Occidental Hotel, 1411-13 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.

(f) Proposed Publication of Revised Regulations

(2) Old Georgetown Act

(a) Building Applications - Appendix 2, dated 12/19/61

(b) Preliminary Submissions:

1. Office Building at 1044-31st St.,N.W. for Philip Reyse

2. Remodel Residence at 1693-34th St., N.W.

3. Revised Sketches of 2813 Q St., N.W. (O.C.3001)

RESOLUTION BY THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS CONCERNING TEMPORARY FEDERAL OFFICE BUILDINGS ON THE MALL, EXTENDING FROM THE CAPITOL - WASHINGTON MONUMENT - LINCOLN MEMORIAL

WHEREAS, temporary Federal office buildings were constructed on the Mall, extending from the Capitol - Washington Monument - Lincoln Memorial, and along the Potomac River in West Potomac Park; and

WHEREAS, it was the intent that these buildings were temporary and would be removed from the parks "within one year after the present war (World War II) is declared ended, the ground will be cleared of improvements, restored to its former condition" as a part of the parks; and

WHEREAS, by Public Law 84-161, approved July 15, 1955 concerning the Central Intelligence Agency's headquarters installations, the United States Congress declared its policy and intent with respect to temporary Federal buildings on park properties by providing in said Public Law "Provided further that at such time as the Central Intelligence Agency occupies the headquarters installation authorized by this title, the Administrator of General Services is authorized and directed to accomplish the demolition and removal of temporary Government building space in the District of Columbia of equivalent occupancy to that relinquished by the Central Intelligence Agency;" and

WHEREAS, these temporary Federal buildings encroach on and desecrate the world-famous Mall and the monumental center of the Nation's Capital and defeat the original design concept of the Mall by obliterating the all-important view between the Lincoln Memorial and the Washington Monument; and

WHEREAS, most of the temporary buildings erected during the World War II emergency are still standing 15 years after expiration of their permits for construction on park land, and still occupy approximately

EXHIBIT A

EXHIBIT A

100 acres of park land, thereby violating the intent and order of the executive and legislative branches of the United States Government; and

WHEREAS, the National Park Service has developed plans to complete the long-standing approved development of the Mall and its roadways; and

WHEREAS, the Commission of Fine Arts has the responsibility to advise and comment upon matters that affect the aesthetic qualities of the Nation's Capital, and upon public buildings constructed by public agencies, which may affect in any important way the appearance of the City of Washington;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED, that the Commission of Fine Arts urges and appeals to the President of the United States and the United States Congress to carry out their stated intent and cause to be removed the temporary Federal buildings occupying park land in the Nation's Capital.

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON D C
NOV 27 1961
NOTED

January 11, 1962

Dear Mr. Banner:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on December 19th, conferred with Mr. Melvin Levine and other members of the staff of the National Capital Downtown Committee, on proposals outlined in the Action Plan, which is to be presented shortly as part of the program for revitalizing the "downtown" business district.

The members of the Commission were generally in agreement with the proposals as outlined by Mr. Levine, except those relating to increasing the height of buildings, which the Commission believes would affect the appearance of the city unfavorably. The plan proposes that the maximum height limitation be increased to 130' throughout the business district. The Commission continues to hold the view that buildings of this height would detract from the essentially open character and scale that make Washington more or less unique among cities. This is one of its major assets and should be preserved. In the opinion of the Commission, the present legal limitations in the central area have reached, and perhaps already exceeded, the limits that are aesthetically desirable.

As a related matter, the members strongly favored the selection of certain streets which would be given special architectural treatment, especially as regards 8th Street, which would be treated as a Mall connecting the Carnegie Library, the Patent Office and the Archives Building. Many of the important vistas to the White House and the Capitol are marred by the haphazard arrangement of buildings and various projections along the streets. It is obviously a situation in need of a more effective architectural control.

Yet it is questionable whether zoning alone would be adequate. Under present zoning regulations, for example, there still is ample leeway in the height and bulk limitations to make continuity of design over an extended length of street unlikely. This is especially true in regard to building setbacks at street level where the resulting open spaces tend to offset the desirable effects of a continuous wall of buildings. The Commission is generally opposed to regulations which permit open space of this sort unless it can be composed as part of a larger design.

The development of a more sympathetic attitude on the part of owners of property fronting on special streets is also probably as important as good zoning and an architectural review by some official agency. Private

EXHIBIT B

January 11, 1968

Dear Mr. Bonner:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on December 19th, disapproved with regret the request of the Secretary of the Navy for approval of the Naval Combat Readiness Complex, to be located on the Naval Station, Anacostia, on the grounds that the proposed design is not appropriate for the historic site adjacent to the Washington Monument.

The members of the Commission were generally in agreement with the proposals as outlined by Mr. Smith, except those relating to the location and height of buildings, which the Commission believes would create an unnecessary visual intrusion on the Washington Monument. The Commission suggested that the Navy reconsider the location of the buildings in relation to the Washington Monument and the Mall, and that the height of the buildings be reduced to a maximum of three stories. The Commission also suggested that the Navy consider the possibility of using the existing Naval Observatory site for the proposed facility, if this could be done without interfering with the Observatory's present use.

In a related matter, the members discussed the relation of certain private uses to the Naval Station. They felt that the Commission should be informed of any proposals for the development of private uses on the Naval Station, and that the Commission should have an opportunity to review such proposals before any commitments are made.

Sincerely yours,

Gustave A. Peterson
Executive Officer

Mr. Wilfred J. Bonner
Director of Public Works
Naval Facilities Engineering Command
Washington, D. C. 20390

organizations made up of these owners have occasionally helped in persuading individual members to develop plans harmonious to some general scheme. Notable examples are the Fifth Avenue and Park Avenue Associations of New York City, which, at least until recently, have proved quite effective in fostering an orderly development of those streets.

The Commission hopes the meeting with members of Downtown Progress has been helpful in the preparation of the proposed standards for the design of the business area, and will be glad to meet again for the review of further details.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Mr. Knox Banner, Executive Director
National Capital Downtown Committee, Inc.
711-14th Street, N. W.
Washington 5, D. C.

December 28, 1961

Dear Mr. Boutin:

The Commission of Fine Arts, at its meeting on December 20th, conferred with Mr. Rowland Snyder of the Public Buildings Service, and with representatives from the architectural firms of Curtis and Davis of New Orleans, Fordyce and Hamby of New York, and Frank Grad & Sons of Newark, regarding the preliminary designs for Federal Office Building No. 5, to be located along Independence Avenue at 10th Street, Southwest.

The architects explained the relationship of the proposed building to the Mall, the Smithsonian Institution, and to the proposed treatment of the 10th Street Mall and L'Enfant Plaza.

The plan as presented by the architects showed a building fronting on Independence Avenue and spanning 10th Street, with automobile access to the latter provided through a portal under the center of the building. Earlier schemes, the architects recalled, had contemplated twin office buildings flanking both sides of 10th Street, which would have opened directly on Independence Avenue and the Smithsonian complex. But because of the unusual profile of 10th Street resulting from the presence of the Pennsylvania Railroad tracks, they concluded that preserving the continuity of the vista along Independence Avenue would be more desirable than to introduce a new and somewhat incomplete view along 10th Street.

The members of the Commission were in complete agreement with this change in concept. Not only did they feel it would tend to offset the presence of the railroad tracks, which the members had long recognized as an unfortunate situation, but in addition, they felt that the preservation of the major axis along Independence Avenue had real merit in itself. Their only reservations regarding this particular approach were chiefly concerned with the resulting length of the major building.

They felt that if the upper mass were set back somewhat from the location shown, and the 800' dimension were reduced to one more nearly 600' long, there would be achieved a setting more sympathetic in scale with the buildings of the Smithsonian Institution.

EXHIBIT C

EXHIBIT C

The Commission would hope, therefore, that the architects will continue to make studies of the overall composition based upon these recommendations, and that these studies will be presented to the Commission prior to the further development of any architectural details.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Honorable Bernard L. Boutin
Administrator
General Services Administration
Washington 25, D. C.

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT of the INTERIOR

★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★★news release

OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY

For Release NOVEMBER 30, 1961

SECRETARY UDALL PROPOSES CREATION OF BOARD TO ESTABLISH STANDARDS FOR MEMORIALS IN NATIONAL CAPITAL AREA

Secretary of the Interior Stewart L. Udall said today the Department has proposed to the Congress that a National Capital Parks Memorial Board be authorized to "prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior broad criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land in the National Capital Parks System."

The Department's report recommending a joint Congressional resolution providing for establishment of the Board, said:

"It is in the public interest that criteria and an orderly plan be developed under which only those persons and events of outstanding national or international importance may be memorialized on land which comprises the National Capital Parks System."

Secretary Udall pointed out that such action first was suggested by the Department of the Interior in 1936.

The Department submitted the proposal for a Memorial Board to the Bureau of the Budget last May and has been advised that enactment would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

The National Capital Parks Memorial Board proposed in the draft resolution would have nine members: Five appointed by the President; the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and the Director of the National Park Service.

Board members would receive no salary, but would be paid travel expenses.

The report said: "

"Memorializations place a constant demand on park land of the Nation's Capital. There are some 96 memorials of the monument or statue type already existing on land in the National Capital Parks System. A number of others have been authorized, but not yet constructed.

"In the 86th Congress (1959-60) alone, seven public laws were enacted authorizing the construction of memorials. At least 17 bills were before the last Congress to authorize the construction of memorials on park lands in the Nation's Capital.

"It is evident that, if the concept of open space and dignity which contribute so much to the beauty of the Nation's Capital is to be preserved in the face of constant pressures to use the land for memorials...each proposal must be carefully evaluated, and sound criteria must be followed."

The Department's report is attached.

EXHIBIT D
X X X

P.N. 104561-61

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF THE INTERIOR
OFFICE OF THE SECRETARY
WASHINGTON 25, D. C.

November 29,1961

Dear Mr. Speaker:

Enclosed is a draft of a proposed joint resolution, "Providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board."

We recommend that the enclosed resolution be referred to the appropriate committee for consideration and that it be enacted. We believe that enactment at the present time is urgent.

The joint resolution creates a National Capital Parks Memorial Board which will prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior broad criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land in the National Capital Parks System. The Board will examine proposals made for memorials and make recommendations thereon to the Secretary of the Interior.

The Board will be composed of nine members, as follows: Five appointed by the President of the United States; the Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission; the Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission; the President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and the Director of the National Park Service. The members of the Board will receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel while engaged in discharging their duties as members of the Board.

Memorializations place a constant demand on park land of the Nation's Capital. There are 96 memorials of the monument or statue type already existing on land in the National Capital Parks System. A number of others have been authorized but not yet constructed. In the 86th Congress alone seven public laws were enacted authorizing the construction of memorials. At least 17 bills were before the last Congress to authorize the construction of memorials on park lands in the Nation's Capital. It is evident that, if the concept of open space and dignity which contribute so much to the beauty of the Nation's Capital is to be preserved in the face of constant pressures to use the land for memorials, sound guidelines for the control of this use must be formulated, a comprehensive plan must be developed, each

proposal must be carefully evaluated, and sound criteria must be steadfastly followed. In fact, such a plan offers the only assurance that sites will be available for future memorials that in all respects merit a location in the parks.

We recommend the establishment of the Memorial Board as a means of meeting the critical situation which confronts the National Capital Parks System. The Board will provide an effective method for focusing attention on the problem, and will help all concerned to view the numerous proposals in proper perspective.

The Bureau of the Budget has advised us that the enactment of this proposed legislation would be consistent with the Administration's objectives.

Sincerely yours,

John A. Carver, Jr.

Assistant Secretary of the Interior

Speaker of the House
of Representatives
Washington 25, D. C.

Enclosure

J O I N T R E S O L U T I O N

Providing for the establishment of the National Capital Parks Memorial Board.

Whereas the memorializing of persons and events without criteria, policy and a general plan therefor impedes sound planning for and use of National Capital Park land; and

Whereas it is in the public interest that criteria and an orderly plan be developed under which only those persons and events of outstanding national or international importance may be memorialized on land which comprises the National Capital Parks System: Now, therefore, be it

Resolved by the Senate and House of Representatives of the United States of America in Congress assembled, That there is hereby created a National Capital Parks Memorial Board. The Board shall prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior broad criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land of the National Capital Parks System through the media of monuments, memorials, and statues. The Board shall examine each proposal for the use of said park land for memorialization purposes, including the importance of the person or event concerned, and shall make recommendations to the Secretary of the Interior with respect to the proposal.

SEC. 2. The National Capital Parks Memorial Board shall be composed of:

(1) Five members to be appointed by the President of the United States;

(2) The Chairman of the Fine Arts Commission;

(3) The Chairman of the National Capital Planning Commission;

(4) The President of the Board of Commissioners of the District of Columbia; and

(5) The Director of the National Park Service.

The memberships filled by the President shall be as follows: one for a term of one year; two for a term of two years; and two for a term of three years. The President shall appoint successor members to hold office for three years, and shall designate a member of the Board to serve as its Chairman. The members of the Board shall receive no salary but may be paid expenses incidental to travel when engaged in discharging their duties as such members.

THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS

ESTABLISHED BY CONGRESS MAY 17, 1910

DAVID E. FINLEY, Chairman
DOUGLAS W. ORR — WILLIAM G. PERRY
RALPH WALKER — MICHAEL RAPUANO
FELIX W. de WELDON — PETER HURD
LINTON B. WILSON, Secretary

21 December 1961

INTERIOR DEPARTMENT BUILDING
WASHINGTON

Dear Mr. Hughes:

At the meeting of the Commission of Fine Arts on December 19th, I read to the members your letter of December 8th enclosing a draft of proposed legislation to establish a National Capital Parks Memorial Board which has been transmitted to the Congress. The draft of the proposed legislation provides for the establishment of a Board, to be composed of nine members, including the Chairman of the Commission of Fine Arts, who will prepare and recommend to the Secretary of the Interior, criteria, guidelines, and policies for memorializing persons and events on Federal land of the National Park System.

This proposed legislation follows in general the proposed draft of a Joint Resolution which you sent to the Commission of Fine Arts on October 19, 1959, with the exception that the earlier draft provided that two members should be appointed by the President of the Senate from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the Senate; two members should be appointed by the Speaker of the House of Representatives from the Interior and Insular Affairs Committee of the House; and three members should be appointed by the President of the United States.

The Commission of Fine Arts, on December 19, 1961, discussed with the Secretary of the Interior, Mr. Udall, the draft of the proposed legislation which you sent to the Commission recently. The members of the Commission pointed out that, insofar as the later draft is concerned, the Commission feels that this additional legislation is not necessary in view of the fact that the law establishing the Commission of Fine Arts in 1910 provides that "It shall be the duty of such Commission to advise upon the location of statues, fountains and monuments in the public squares, streets, and parks in the District of Columbia, and upon the selection of models for statues, fountains, and monuments, erected under the authority of the United States and upon the selection of artists for the execution of the same. It shall be the duty of the officers charged by law to determine such questions in each case to call for such advice." I enclose a copy of the law referred to. The National Capital Planning Commission, of which the Director of the National Park Service is a member, is also authorized by law to make recommendations as to sites for memorials in Washington. That Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts, as well as the National Park Service, consult with reference to such matters concerning memorials as come before them.

EXHIBIT E

29 December 1961

Dear Mr. Secretary:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts were glad to have an opportunity of talking with you informally at their meeting on December 19th, about problems that arise in connection with statues and memorials in Washington. We are in agreement with you, I think, that statues and memorials here, erected to the memory of our great men and designed by distinguished artists, are desirable, but that care should be taken that such memorials should not be authorized too soon after the death of the individual who is to be honored.

The Commission looks forward to consulting with you or your representative in the case of future memorials that may arise, particularly as to sites that may be available in Washington. The Commission feels that many small triangular parks along the avenues offer excellent sites for small monuments. We hope that you are in agreement with this and that you will approve the erection of the statue of Doctor Benjamin Rush in the park at 18th Street and Pennsylvania Avenue, where, we feel, the beauty and interest of the area will be enhanced by this statue.

As stated at our meeting, the members of the Commission feel that the proposed National Capital Parks Memorial Board would duplicate duties now imposed by Congress on the National Capital Planning Commission and the Commission of Fine Arts as regards sites for memorials, and on the Commission of Fine Arts as regards the design for such memorials. They feel that the establishment of an additional Board might result in confusion and hope that the law will continue to be administered as at present.

I should like to reiterate our desire to be helpful in these matters and to express our pleasure at having had an opportunity to talk with you about them.

For the Commission of Fine Arts:

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

The Honorable Stewart L. Udall
The Secretary of the Interior
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT F

DEC 1 2 1961

QMCRE-H

Mr. David E. Finley
The Commission of Fine Arts
Interior Department Building
Washington 25, D. C.

Dear Mr. Finley:

The Quartermaster General is grateful for your helpful letter of 2 November 1961. I appreciate the time and effort devoted by the Commission to the review of our heraldic designs.

The Heraldic Institute is considering the use of talented and experienced sculptors outside of the Department of Defense to correlate suggestions from requesting agencies into new designs which will have artistic significance.

Your interest and suggestions such as the use of the Society of Medalists, the National Sculpture Society, and the National Academy of Design are most beneficial. We will continue to request advice from your Agency in providing meaningful and artistic designs to our sponsors.

Sincerely yours,

B. E. KENDALL
Brigadier General, USA
Acting Deputy The Quartermaster General

EXHIBIT G

RECEIVED
THE COMMISSION OF FINE ARTS
WASHINGTON, D. C.
DEC 13 1961
NOTED

8 December 1961

Dear General North:

The members of the Commission of Fine Arts have asked me to advise you that they recommend the designation of Mr. John Carl Warneke as architect for the proposed memorial on Guam.

The Commission will be glad to see the designs for the memorial.

Sincerely yours,

David E. Finley
Chairman

Maj. Gen. Thomas North
Secretary
American Battle Monuments Commission
Washington 25, D. C.

EXHIBIT H

EXHIBIT I

THE GEORGETOWN WATERFRONT
A SUMMARY REPORT AND DEVELOPMENT PROPOSAL

Introduction

In response to widespread community concern and specific requests from the Georgetown citizens' associations, the National Capital Planning Commission has conducted an intensive two-year study of the Georgetown Waterfront.* The purpose of the study was to determine how this strategic area might be developed to its full potential. Part I of this report briefly describes the existing situation and discusses some results and conclusions of the study; Part II presents a proposal for the development of the Waterfront area. Comments and suggestions regarding this proposal are especially desired and will be given careful consideration.

Part I

The Existing Situation

The Georgetown Waterfront adjoins the Potomac River at a particularly prominent location in our Nation's Capital. It lies in full view of three major approaches to the monumental core of the city: Key Bridge, Memorial Bridge, and the soon-to-be-completed Theodore Roosevelt Bridge. A short distance downstream, in Foggy Bottom, is the proposed site for the National Cultural Center. Directly opposite the Waterfront is Theodore Roosevelt Island, a national memorial. Immediately adjacent is the Thompson Water Sports Center, and to the north are the prestigious residential areas of historic Old Georgetown.

In blatant contrast to this panorama of quality development and natural beauty which surrounds it, the Waterfront offers assorted smokes and smells, neglect, obsolescence and a haphazard mixture of generally run-down industrial and commercial buildings, interspersed with small groups of row houses. Litter from junk yards blows across the area. Heavy trucks rumble up and down the narrow tree-lined streets. Historic buildings are in danger of demolition (several have already been demolished). Potentially magnificent views of the river and monuments are blocked by smoke stacks and industrial apparatus. Residential groupings overlook open storage yards, concrete batching plants and the elevated Whitehurst Freeway. Many

*The Georgetown Waterfront area is located roughly between Rock Creek Park and Key Bridge and between M Street and the Potomac River.

structures stand vacant, yet every available public space is taken during the day for employee parking.

While the Waterfront has a truly enormous potential for predominantly residential use, this potential is continually threatened by proposed changes that could permanently destroy it. Three such changes are now planned: (1) an ice skating rink which will occupy most of a long-vacant factory; (2) a four-story office building at a strategic location along the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal; and (3) a large office building or motel on a site formerly occupied by a steel plant. A particularly tempting target for commercial exploitation is the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal which traverses the area from east to west and is a favorite place for artists, fishermen and strollers. Altogether, the Waterfront is fraught with land speculation, if only for the simple reason of its location within the boundaries of historic Old Georgetown.

The foregoing describes the general problem situation which the Waterfront Study sought to document, analyze and, hopefully, find a way to remedy. All aspects were considered--financial, economic, social and physical. Various treatment schemes were prepared in order to determine land re-use feasibilities. Consulting services were employed and special reports prepared on two particularly crucial issues: historic values and structures, and the economics of the riverfront industrial complex. While it is not the purpose of this paper to report in detail the results of the many studies conducted, a few highlights might help to put the Waterfront situation in a clearer perspective.

1. There are 97 gross acres in the Waterfront area. Two-thirds is used for industrial purposes. Less than 8 per cent is presently used for housing.

2. Thirty-eight per cent of the non-residential structures in the area are blighted. But 90 per cent of the row houses are in satisfactory condition.

3. Land values range between 5 and 12 dollars per square foot and appear to be rising.

4. There are 59 structures of historic value remaining in the area. Some, such as the Thomas Jefferson house and the Francis Scott Key house, have been destroyed but could be reconstructed. The Waterfront area possesses a long and illustrious history both as a major eastern seaport and as a place of residence and entertainment for Washington dignitaries. It is worth noting that Washington, Jefferson and L'Enfant met frequently at a tavern in the area when they were making plans for the National Capital.

5. Present zoning in the Waterfront area is predominantly industrial, and new residential construction is prohibited in all of the area except for sections of M Street. Two of the industries on the riverfront are nonconforming uses, but can remain at their present locations until they decide to move or go out of business. One of these, a small fat rendering plant, is so obnoxious that it is prohibited in all zoned areas of the Washington region.

6. Many structures are vacant. A recent survey of M Street found 22 vacant first floor commercial establishments, and most commercial structures showed no signs of use above the first floor. Along the riverfront four of the largest industrial structures are empty and unused (one is being renovated for use as an ice rink) and a fifth is being demolished.

7. In contrast to the vacancies and marginal uses around them, several major industries along the riverfront are healthy, well-run and would prefer to remain at their locations for many years to come. These industries are aware that their land could be sold for non-industrial re-uses at high prices, but this does not offset the fact for them that selling would mean either re-establishing elsewhere at their own expense or going out of business, plus the loss of a competitive advantage afforded by their present location. A special study of Waterfront industrial activity indicates, however, that these major industries could be successfully relocated if compensated fairly for real and personal property losses as well as relocation costs. One of two would suffer the loss of a distinct locational competitive advantage, and some losses or shifts in sales might result, but these would represent a small share of total volume and would be potentially recoverable insofar as the long-term competitive position of the firms would not be affected.

8. Accessibility is the main locational factor which keeps the industries on the Waterfront. They are on the periphery of downtown where much of the new construction is occurring (most of the prospering industries on the Waterfront are related to building construction), they are easily accessible to Northern Virginia and Maryland, and they have direct rail and water access, although water transportation is used only by one industry. Until the Inner Loop is completed, very few, if any, industrial locations can offer comparable accessibility.

9. A similar paradoxical sprinkling of thriving activity within a general context of decline, exists on M Street. Some commercial establishments there--mostly restaurants and specialty shops--are among the most successful in the District. But these few flourishing enterprises are like flowers in a weed patch, existing not because of their environment, but in spite of it.

Conclusions

Out of these exhaustive and comprehensive studies of the Waterfront, three major conclusions concerning the development of the area emerged. These conclusions served as the basis for the development proposal presented in Part II.

Conclusion 1. The Georgetown Waterfront area does not have an industrial future. It is true, as noted earlier, that several industries are healthy and want to stay at their present locations indefinitely. But the long-run prospect for continued industrial use of the area is negative, for the simple but compelling reason that land in the area already costs 5 to 10 times what most new industry is willing to pay. Lack of room for future expansion is a second major deterrent to industrial development. From the Capital planning point of view, the area is unsuitable for industry if only for the reason of its location within the monumental core of the Capital City; but the inappropriateness of industrial use to the surrounding residential areas and park uses is no less important.

Unless suitable action is taken, however, existing industry can be expected to remain on the Waterfront for many years to come, passing through a cycle of conversion to marginal use, vacancy and eventual abandonment and demolition. Such a cycle might take a half-century and more to complete.

Conclusion 2. Private enterprise alone cannot achieve the "enormous potential" of the Waterfront area. The argument has been made that only a zoning change to permit new residential construction is needed in order to achieve the redevelopment of the area for low-density row housing under the normal processes of private enterprise. However, it will take a good deal more than a zoning change and the actions of private investment to achieve several of the principal objectives held for the area. For example, private enterprise will not redevelop the shoreline for public use; it will not widen the boundaries of and improve public access to the C&O Canal; it will not remove some of the most objectionable uses from the area, at least for many years to come (and it is doubtful if high quality row houses will ever be built in significant numbers in the area until certain objectionable uses are removed); and it will not restore M Street as a quality boulevard.

M Street in Georgetown requires more than "paint-up, fix-up." It is one of the most congested streets in the city. Public parking space is almost nonexistent during the day. Gas stations, automobile sales and supplies, and liquor stores are the major commercial uses. It is a dirty, smelly and generally unpleasant street on which to walk or drive. Before M Street can ever become

a highly desirable place on which to live, shop or do business, something must be done to solve these problems, problems which private initiative alone cannot resolve.

Conclusion 3. A unified plan of development is necessary in order to achieve a desirable rebuilding of the area. The rebuilding of the Waterfront area can take a long time to achieve, depending upon the methods used. In any case, it is illusory to think that even a small measure of the "enormous potential" can be achieved without a total plan for the area accompanied by strong regulations to ensure that the plan is adhered to over the course of years.

Otherwise, the area will flounder from crisis to crisis as each parcel of land is rebuilt, the owner in most cases attempting to obtain maximum benefit from his investment by building as high and as wide as he possibly can, regardless of the effect on surrounding property or aesthetic considerations. Without a plan, there is no rational basis for opposing such efforts. And zoning alone is a weak defense unless it is based on such an overall public plan.

Part II

A Proposal for the Development of the Waterfront

It is proposed that the Georgetown Waterfront be restored and redeveloped in order to make it a predominantly residential area, but with an international flavor. A principal feature in the area would be an International Affairs Center, located on the riverfront a ten-minute walk from the State Department. The area would also include shops and restaurants specializing in foreign products and foods, and a small museum for displays by foreign nations. Sites would be provided for a limited number of embassies and small chanceries of residential scale, which would add prestige and enhance the international atmosphere. A special school organized to help foreign children to bridge the difficult language gap they encounter on arrival could be established by the District of Columbia.

All non-compatible and inappropriate uses would be removed from the area, and only three classes of buildings would be retained: buildings of architectural or historic significance, houses of distinct quality, and certain essential public and semi-public uses.

A variety of housing would be provided: town houses, maisonettes and small apartments. Their general design and scale would be harmonious to the established character of Old Georgetown. The quality of all residential units would be very high, although an effort would be made to provide some housing accommodations at modest rentals for diplomatic personnel who would want to be near the International Center and any chanceries or embassies which might locate in the area. A predominant resident population of Americans, with a sprinkling of foreign diplomatic personnel, would be encouraged.

Vehicular traffic would be kept to a minimum; movement would be primarily on foot and the area would be designed to make pedestrian circulation safe, convenient and pleasant. M Street would be restored to its former importance as a residential-business-shopping boulevard, with wide sidewalks, trees, and far less traffic than presently travels it. Parking and service access would be provided at the rear of properties facing on M Street.

Strong emphasis would be placed on the enhancement of both the riverfront and the Chesapeake and Ohio Canal. Shops and outdoor cafes, carefully controlled and in limited number, could be provided at selected points bordering on the Canal, and would do much to increase the attractiveness and use of this vital asset. A system of footpaths would link

the Canal with the riverfront, M Street and the International Affairs Center. The riverfront would be cleared of the existing industrial uses and would be redeveloped for park use, with limited recreational facilities and possibly a marina. The International Affairs Center would be located at the southeast end of the park, near to the Thompson Water Sports Center.

The broad purpose of the International Affairs Center, as stated in a bill to be introduced before Congress, would be "to provide certain facilities to promote the foreign policy of the United States, to promote increased interest in foreign relations, to promote meetings and contacts among American governmental officials, the Diplomatic Corps; members of Congress, representatives of the international agencies, and private citizens in connection with matters having to do with the conduct of foreign relations so as to better establish relationships which will promote international understanding."

The Center would offer a combination of educational, cultural, and social facilities. There would be, in one complex, eating places, meeting rooms, spaces for formal entertaining, central kitchen facilities, a hospitality center, and any other facilities which would make foreign diplomats feel welcome in Washington. A riverside promenade would connect the Center to the proposed Cultural Center and would also make the International Affairs Center pleasantly and easily accessible to the State Department.

Serious efforts would be made to reconstruct several of the particularly important homes which formerly existed in the area, such as the Francis Scott Key home and Corcoran house. Historic buildings now existing in the area would be restored and put to an appropriate use. These buildings would serve as a nucleus for the reconstruction of the area, and would represent tangible links with the area's distinguished history.

This proposal for the Georgetown Waterfront area would require the relocation of several industrial activities, hopefully to other sites within the District, such as along the Anacostia River, and possibly on future private portions of Anacostia-Bolling Fields. The Baltimore and Ohio Railroad spur line would have to be removed and the proposed Potomac Freeway would best be placed under the elevated Whitehurst Freeway rather than parallel to it, as now planned. This would preserve sufficient riverside frontage to develop a park surrounding the International Affairs Center.

Public authority to acquire land would be necessary. It does not seem realistic to think that objectionable and inappropriate uses could be removed or bought out, or that sufficient amounts of land could be assembled to permit significant rebuilding without the power of eminent domain. Because of the obsolete and deteriorated nature of a large number of the structures, it is believed the area does qualify for Federal financial assistance for urban renewal.

While this proposal entails a program that would be both costly and difficult to achieve, there is widespread community support to do something now to save the area before the "enormous potential" is permanently lost. The general sentiment is that only a "Grand Design" is worthy of the area and can rise above the many conflicting pressure groups which have their own special designs on it. It is felt that this proposal can produce such a design -- one that will meet an important need and also serve to enhance the quality, beauty and prestige of the Capital City.

The alternative to this proposal would be to deny the Waterfront area "special treatment," to let the opportunity go by despite its critical effect on the appearance and dignity of the city; to leave it to the caprice and fortunes of the real estate market, and, in effect, to let the Nation's Capital wear this blackeye on its face for another half-century.

STAFF REPORT
National Capital Planning Commission
October, 1961

The Board of Architectural Consultants for Georgetown submits the following comments on The Georgetown Waterfront—A Summary Report and Development Proposal, prepared by the staff of the National Capital Planning Commission.

The members of the Board agree with the goals outlined in the report, that is, the elimination of blighted industrial uses and the replacement of an essentially residential character to the area, but they differ primarily on the means to this end. They believe that urban renewal procedures, as usually applied on a large scale, would not preserve the "historic value of the said Georgetown district," as intended by the Old Georgetown Act.

The Planning Commission Staff asserts in the report that "only a 'Grand Design' is worthy of the area." It would seem evident that the above statement is intended to be the essence of any renewal scheme. In the opinion of the Board, such a composition planned as a whole might destroy the street pattern, and be inconsistent with the architectural growth of a typical 18th and 19th Century river-port such as Georgetown.

The Board would like to make clear at this point, however, that it welcomes the preparation of an overall study by the Planning Commission Staff. Such a study could provide a useful framework within which to establish the rezoning of certain portions necessary for the removal of unsuitable uses. Revised zoning measures could be tailored specifically to give a general order to the new construction in terms of height, massing, etc., but at the same time avoid the sterile appearance that tends to result from a completely designed community. The latter approach might have merit in isolated circumstances, but not in the case of the area in question, which is an integral part of Old Georgetown.

EXHIBIT J

As to the Waterfront itself, the Board believes that this area, extending along "K" Street south to the water's edge, is of such importance in its relation to the Potomac River, Roosevelt Island, and other adjoining Parklands, that it merits special consideration. They would recommend that any means be used to rid this area of its industrial uses and to convert it to a park. In this respect they would support the Staff proposal to give careful consideration to the location of the proposed additional freeway—either below or beside the existing Whitehurst Freeway. As presently conceived by the Department of Highways, the new freeway would parallel "K" Street from 29th Street to Wisconsin Avenue. At that point however, it would separate from the old freeway and run directly along the river bank, under the first water arch of Key Bridge. Such an elevated structure, the Board believes, would severely limit the value of any future park in this location.

In conclusion the Board is glad to see the renewed interest in the Waterfront area and its potential values. It will be glad to cooperate in every way possible to see that the design of the development proceeds in the best possible manner.

Walter M. Macomber

Gerald A. Purcell

Henry H. Saylor

19 December 1961